



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/692,465 | 10/23/2003 | Brad L. Noll | 1940-031320 | 7255 |

28289 7590 10/29/2007
THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C.
700 KOPPERS BUILDING
436 SEVENTH AVENUE
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

KRISHNAMURTHY, RAMESH

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3753

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

10/29/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

88

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/692,465 | Applicant(s) NOLL ET AL. | |
| | Examiner /Ramesh Krishnamurthy/ | Art Unit 3753 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 24, 26 - 28, 30, 32 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 26-28,30,32 and 33 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 9, 11 - 20 and 22 - 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3753

This office action is responsive to communications filed August 15, 2007.

Claims 1 – 24, 26 - 28, 30 and 32 – 33 are pending.

Applicant's claim to domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) has been noted.

1. This application contains claims 10 and 21 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the communication filed 12/14/2005. Claims 10 and 21 remain withdrawn for further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species.

2. **Claims 1 – 9, 11 – 20, 22 – 24, 26 - 28, 30 and 32 – 33 remain for further consideration.**

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 – 7 and 11 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Noll et al. (US 6,581,626).

The applied reference has a common assignee and inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this

Art Unit: 3753

application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

The '626 patent to Noll et al. discloses a modular casing or a check valve arrangement that comprises a housing having an inlet end (17) and an outlet end (19) defining a flow channel therebetween formed by sidewalls and a bottom wall of the housing, a modular cage (45, 55) removably secured to said housing, the modular cage having an interior cavity wherein at least one check valve assembly is removably placed. A fluid seal each (67) in the form of a gasket is positioned at the two ends of the modular cage for sealing the cage within the flow channel the housing. The modular cage shows a lip (near (355), See Fig. 8). It is noted that the arrangement disclosed in '626 patent necessarily performs the method recited in claim 25 in its usual and normal operation. It is noted that the cage (45, 55) is indeed non-movable in that once it is installed in the housing, as shown in Fig. 4 of the '626 patent, it is indeed non-movable and thus has a non-movable construction.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 8, 9 and 22 - 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noll et al. (US 6,581,626) as applied to claims 1 - 7 and 11 - 20 above, and further in view of Sisk (US 6,679,289).

The '626 patent to Noll et al. discloses the claimed invention with the exception of explicitly disclosing the fastening means between the modular casing and the housing to comprise an outwardly extending lug.

The patent to Sisk discloses a modular fluid casing wherein a lug extends outwardly from said housing (see Figs. 1 and 2, for example) the lug defining an orifice adapted to receive a fastener (3). The modular cage defines at least one protrusion (37) having a slot (38) aligned with said orifice of said lug whereby the fastener (3) passes through the slot and the orifice for the purpose of reliably securing said modular cage to the housing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Noll'626 and arrangement of fastening as disclosed in Sisk for the purpose of reliably securing said modular cage to the housing.

8. Claims 26, 27, 28, 30, 32 and 33 are allowed.

Art Unit: 3753

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed August 15, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as evident from the rejection set forth above. In particular, the limitation that the modular cage is of a non-movable construction is met by the '692 patent in that once it is installed in the housing, as shown in Fig. 4 of the '626 patent, it is indeed non-movable. The arguments by the applicant concerning the obviousness rejection set forth in previous office action concerning claims 8, 9 and 22 - 24 were persuasive resulting in the withdrawal of the same.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramesh Krishnamurthy whose telephone number is (571) 272 - 4914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 10:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson, can be reached on (571) 272 - 4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 - 8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Ramesh Krishnamurthy/

Ramesh Krishnamurthy
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753